Scott. H-27—23,006—24-12-32.

Revenue (1934) Department.

MB SERIES.

G.O. No. 351

DATED 20. 2. 1934.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Settlement - Resettlement. (South Kanara)
Coconut plantations on dry lands
Classification as garden - orders
for

'AGRICULTURAL' DEPARTMENT.

D 3657-III
3-10-33

Rr 3467E

Received 7-OCT 1933 19 Registered 57033 19

Subject.

E 2
5/10/33

COCONUT PLANTATIONS RE-CLASSIFICATION OF DRY LANDS INTO GARDEN LANDS.-

Dev. Deptt.

Revenue no.

Dev. no. 3657 III/33-1
4.10.33

3.X.33
3/10

RR
4.10.33

ENCLOSURES.
No. .....
.....
Spare copies .....

D.3- No. 1483/33.

Station Madras. *Dated the* 27th September 1933.

From (Name) S.V.Ramamurty Esq., I.C.S.,
(Designation) Director of Agriculture,

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Development Department.

Sir,

I enclose the petition of M.R.Ry.K.L.Bhandary Avl., B.A., together with the report of the Deputy Director of Agriculture thereon R.O.C.No.791/33 dated the 13th September 1933, giving in detail the hardships that would be caused to the ryots by the re-classification of dry land where cocomuts are grown into garden land, for levy of garden assessment. The report of the Deputy Director states the position fully. The need is to distinguish between the cultivation of cocomuts with rain or restricted irrigation and with full irrigation. The former is

resorted to practically entirely only in the West Coast. The growing of coconuts on dry land on the West Coast has been one of the main items of improvement introduced by the Agricultural Department and a considerable area of Government waste land has been so used. The classification of such land as garden land under the same conditions as irrigated land will probably stop the extension of coconuts on dry land and will not only lead to a smaller growth of Government revenue than otherwise, but also give a set back to the extended cultivation of coconuts in this country which is needed to meet the internal demand for coconuts for industrial uses without imports from outside.

2. I therefore recommend that the criterion proposed by the Deputy Director of Agriculture, namely that trees should be 25 years old before they are treated as bearing in the case of coconut cultivation on dry land on the West Coast, may be accepted for settlement classification.

I have the honour to be,
S i r,
Your most obedient servant,

DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE.

3/3 DEPARTMENT.

In reply, please quot [redacted] mber, dato and title.

Received ..... *Registered* D.3.1483/33

DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE 15 SEP 1933 MADRAS

From (Name) M.R.Ry. K. T. Alwa Avl.,

(Designation) Dy. Director of Agriculture,

Post Box ....., (Station) VII Circle, Tellicherry.

Telegraphic Address .....

To The Director of Agriculture,

Madras.

Sir,

R.O.C No. 791-33, dated 13th September 1933.

Enclosures 2

Spare Copies .....

I submit herewith the petition of M.R.Ry. K. L. Bhandary Avl., B.A., for your kind consideration. On account of settlement operations now in progress in South Kanara district the Agricultural Department is facing with new difficulties. After the start of the Coconut Research stations in the West Coast, intensive propaganda was done to pursuade people to take dry waste lands on darkhast and plant coconut. Thereby a lot of unoccupied waste lands were taken on patta by paying dry assessment of 12 annas to a rupee per acre and coconut planting was done. To enclose the land, to plant coconut and to maintain the plantations for the past few years the cultivators had to invest their capital. In most cases, although a few trees have begun to bear a small number of nuts the plantations have not yet begun to yield sufficiently to give the cultivators a profit. According to settlement rules, I understand, if there are ten bearing trees in an acre it will be reclassified as garden land and garden assessment will be levied. The word bearing is very elastic for settlement purpose. A tree having a single nut or a flower spathe can be considered as bearing although it is not sufficiently bearing from an economic point of view. Almost all the new dry land plantations in the district have not yet become 'bearing' from an economic point of view although a few trees have begun to

bear a few nuts in some of the plots. Planting coconut on high lying dry lands where the water level is low is a new venture and I am of opinion that trees on such lands will not give a reasonable yield till the trees are 25 years old

2. If the settlement principle of ten bearing trees per acre is followed and the new dry land coconut plantations are reclassified as garden lands, there will be a great set back on further extension of coconut cultivation in the district and those who have undertaken the venture will suffer. Unless the trees bear on an average about 25 nuts per tree, the plantations cannot be considered paying to the cultivators and increase in assessment cannot be justified. I am submitting herewith a statement showing the cost of starting a coconut plantation, the average cost per tree and the yield. These figures were collected from the records of the Nileshwar Coconut Research Station No.II where ordinary manuring and intercultivation are given to trees. Taking into consideration the plantings of 1918 and 1919 (blocks I, II, III, IV, V, VI) trees were 12 to 13 years old in the year 1931 and fairly large number of trees had begun to bear, but the average yield per tree was low. Taking the value of each nut as 6 pies, the yield did not cover the cost of cultivation in most cases. So it will take some years more for us to get the annual cost of cultivation and reasonable interest on the capital invested.

3. A question will naturally arise ~~which will be~~ the probable age of trees when increased rates of assessment can be levied on dryland plantations. I consider 75 years will be the life period of coconut trees in these dry lands and the first 25 years should be left to the ryots to bring up the plantation without increasing the assessment and the next 50 years is a good period for the Government to get increased assessment. At the close of 25 years I expect the

ryot would be able to reap a harvest of 25 nuts per tree when he should not grudge to pay the increased assessment.

K. J. Adv

Dy. Director of Agriculture,
VII Circle.

Agricultural Research Station - Nileshwar No. II.

F 5513/33-1

Block No.	Area in acres	No. of trees	Year of planting	Year of flowering	No. of trees flowered up to 1931	Yield of nuts								Expenditure per tree in 1931			Total expenditure to end of 1931 per tree			Average expenditure per tree per year up to 1931		
						1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	Average per bearing tree in 1931	Rs	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs	A.	P.
I	2·86	154	1918	1925	142	2	462	1027	1351	2211	2511	2840	20	-	7	2	9	2	8	-	11	3
II	2·74	147	1918	1926	130	-	108	397	683	1389	1544	1629	12	-	7	4	9	2	4	-	11	3
III	2·31	132	1919	1926	115	-	42	357	701	1494	1677	1759	15	-	7	10	8	11	-	-	11	7
IV	1·94	105	1919	1926	90	-	15	121	301	839	1202	1217	14	-	8	9	8	14	-	-	11	10
V	2·02	110	1918	1925	100	4	343	954	1090	2364	2459	2277	23	-	11	9	9	10	9	-	11	11
VI	1·94	105	1918	1925	98	1	88	318	594	1324	1579	1534	16	-	7	10	9	4	11	-	11	5

Agricultural Research Station - [illegible]

Region	Area in [illegible]	No. of years planting	No. of years flowering	No. of [illegible]	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	Average per year	Explosives Total explo.						Average explosives per year for 1931	Min. per year for 1931
I	2.86	1918	1925	1944	-	1067	1152	1211	1351	1384	58	-	7.2	4	2	8	-	11	3	
II	3.04	1918	1926	190	-	1068	1242	1389	1384	1624	12	-	1.4	4	2	4	-	11	3	
III	2.31	1918	1926	115	-	42	3242	1404	1252	1254	15	-	1.0	8	11	-	-	11	1	
IV	1.04	1914	1927	90	-	15	1201	1302	834	301	1201	14	-	6	9	8	14	-	11	10
V	2.02	1918	1925	100	4	343	4524	2844	2844	1040	2211	23	-	11	4	10	4	11	11	11
VI	1.04	1914	1925	94	1	318	3242	1324	1524	1524	1414	16	-	1	10	4	11	4	11	11

1 copy MKG 3 1/2

9

From,

K. L. Bhandary,
B. A.,

Kundapur.

The Director of Agriculture

Madras.

Sir,

Ref : Demonstration plot - Patta No.2.
Marvanthe Village, South Kanara District.

I feel compelled to represent the following :-

1. In 1920 the Government appointed me Hon. Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies in South Kanara District, seing the interest that I evinced in village uplift work. I was the first to be so appointed and continued to be so till 1927 when the policy involved therein was given up.

In the course of that period, my enthusiasm for work and for doing some effective non-Official propaganda, I applie for assignment of 5 acres of waste land in Marvanthe Village, 6 miles north (a river intervenes in the way) from here, to the Collector of South Kanara through the Deputy Director of Agriculture, VII Circle, Tellichery seing my bona fides in the matter of propaganda, on the recommendation of the Deputy Director (Mr. Govinda Kidav who I understand is now retired from service) the Collector (C.A. Souter, Esqr., I.C.S.) granted me 4½ acres of wasteland which is now comprised in Patta No.2 of the said Village. In the assignment, a clause has been inserted thus, viz., "the grant of these plots is subject to the condition that the pattadar Mr. K. L. Bhandary should start cocoanut cultivation on the lines dictated by the Agriculturral Department within 2 years on pain of resumtion" (Collector's R.Dis.No.5969 - 24 Dated 14-6-1924).

2. Accordingly, I started work and improvements. Apart from capital expenditure and initial outlay, I have been spending annually a recurring expenditure as follows :-

Years.		
25 - 26 to 30 - 31	Rs. 76/- each year as detailed below :-	
	Ploughing thrice - - -	Rs.30- 0- 0
	Manuring (ashes, bonemeal or superphosphate, green leaf, etc.,) at 3/- as. per plant. - - -	Rs.36- 0- 0
	Assessment. - - -	Rs. 5- 0- 0
	Up-keep of wall or enclosure.	Rs. 5- 0- 0
		Rs.76--0--0

In the succeeding 2 years, I spent annually only Rs.70/- per year, as I reduced the ploughing charges to Rs.27/- and manuring to Rs.33/-.

31 - 32 & 32 - 33	Rs.70/- per year.

There was no income at all in the first 5 years; and in the next two years, I got 150 & 250 cocoanuts valued at Rs.6/- and 10/- respectively.

I do not know how many more years it will take, to realise as income at least that much, which is being spent annually; or whether the expenditure will be ever paying at all.

3. When I thus feel embarrassed, it pains me to hear from the Village Karnam that the "dry" nature of the land is now to be classified as "Garden" under instructions preparatory to fresh settlement operations. The result is obvious.

The assessment will be multiplied 7 or 8 times. I confess my incapacity to pay any higher assessment atleast for another 30 years, in view of the facts stated above.

4. I, therefore venture to make a very modest request and that is, that you would be good enough to take over the plot and run it as a Departmental concern after evaluating the improvements in your own way and paying the same to me. I now find that, to be too costly and not commercially - profitable or paying

Should you however think that I must continue to do the good work begun under your auspices, even at a sacrifice, for some time more, I have to request you to kindly address the Collector that any re-classification or increased assessment to be based thereon will be nothing short of a tragic hardship, if not an injustice to me.

Your obedient servant,

K. R. Mandan

KUNDAPUR.
18--8--1933.

Forwarded through the
Dy Director of agriculture VII Circle.
Tellicherry

15

Rev. dept.

Cdms

32/10

Hll

Cdms no 34 675/33 - LD 10.X.33

Settlement - Resettlement. (South Kanara) - Coconut plantations on dry lands - Classification as garden Letter from the Director of Agriculture, Dy. No 14883/33 dt 27.9.33

Hpl-rep.

Dpd. by Van Post

Dpt. Initials SW

Date 11/10 193 .

Referred to the Board g/Rs for early remarks.

Ltr to Bd

DK. 6110/33 - 7.10.33

The Board g/Rs, ARHS.

(with acgg. of Hpl-rep & Hps 3-14 ex. in cgl h/w retd)

7/10

Rn. -12-33.

11.10.33

17

Revenue DEPARTMENT. C.F. 31

CURRENT No. 35-E

Received 21/12/33 19 Registered 3134 19

Subject.

E2 file 3/1/34

Settlement - Resettlement - (South Kanara) - Cocoanut plantations on dry lands - Classification as garden - Report submitted.

ENCLOSURES.
No.
Spare copies

Reference - F. No. 3513/33.2.

Station Madras, *Dated the* 20th December 1933.

From M.K. Vellodi Esq., I.C.S.,
Joint Secretary,
Land Revenue. and
~~The~~ Board of Revenue, ~~Revenue~~ Settlement, ~~etc.~~
~~Separate Revenue.~~

J.F.Hall Esq.,C.I.E.,O.B.E.,I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Land Revenue and Settlement.

~~Resolution~~
~~Reference.~~

Read the following.-

pp 21-30 myn

Letter from E.W. Bouchier Esq., I.C.S., Special Settlement Officer, Party No.IV, Mangalore, Ref.No. A.2.3524/33-1 dated 21st November 1933.and the endorsement of the Collector of South Kanara, dated 26th November 1933

Reference.-

Submitted to the Government.

2. The Board agrees with the Special Settlement Officer that the dry plantations in South Kanara should be left as 'dry' if they are not mature and -- productive though possibly bearing. The Special

Settlement

Settlement Officer considers that the result will be few, that probably none of the new 'dry' gardens -- started on the advice of the Agricultural department will be reclassified at the resettlement.

3. The Special Settlement Officer suggests that in dealing with gardens at the bottom of the scale, the Settlement Officer should be allowed a fairly wide discretion to retain such gardens as dry and must not be restricted to the application of hard and fast rules. The Board submits that in the case of Malabar, the 'spread over' and the adjoining garden' principles laid down by Government for the reclassification at resettlement of dry lands as garden were followed -- rigidly in their application giving rise to some cases of substantial hardship due to the large increase of assessment. The rules should of course have been followed as guiding principles and ought not to have been applied too strictly. As submitted in Board's Refce.No.F. 2625/33.2 dated 19-12-33 the Special Settlement Officer, No.IV Party is under the instructions of the Commissioner of Land Revenue and Settlement following the above proposals as guides only and not as rigid rules in reclassifying dry lands as garden in South Kanara. The Special Settlement Officer is also ignoring the jack tree in the two bottom tarams in -- accordance with the decision arrived at in the Conference with the Hon'ble the Revenue Member at Ootacamund in -

September last. Actually hard cases are thus not being created in South Kanara.

Joint Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department
with enclosure
Copy to the Special Settlement Officer, No.IV.Party.Mangalor
Copy to the Collector of South Kanara.

m.k.g/21.12.

Enclosed is
Board's Ltr F.3513/
dated 2-0

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Confidential.

C.F. 32.

reply, please quote number, date and hort title

Settlement Party. ~~DEPARTMENT~~

Received..... *Registered* Confdl 594 23 30.11.32

From (Name) E. W. Bouchier Esquire, I. C. S.,

(Designation) Special Settlement Officer, Party No.IV,

Post Box....., (Station) Mangalore.

Telegraphic Address.....

To

The Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land Revenue and Settlement,
Chepauk, M a d r a s.
through the Collector of South Kanara.

Ref. A2 *No.* 3524/33-1 *dated* 21st November 19 33.

Sir,

Enclosures.....
1 Statement

Spare Copies.....

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara district - Coconut plantations on dry lands - Classification as garden Report - S u b m i t t e d.

Ref: Board's reference F.3513/33-1, dated 23/10/33.

I have inspected the Nileshwar No.2 and 3 experimental stations and have discussed the matter with the Deputy Director of Agriculture, Tellicherry. A good deal of information on the subject is contained in Leaflet No.44 of the Department of Agriculture. The Leaflet bears no date but was, apparently, published in 1928. I did not inspect the Pilicode (sometimes referred to as Nileshwar No.I) station. I understand it is inferior to the Nileshwar No.2, which is considered to be the best of the new "dry" plantations. At Kasaragod, the Department took over plantations which had already been developed. The results of that station demonstrate the benefits of "intercultivation" and regular manuring, unaccompanied by artificial irrigation, in a mature garden. They do not prove that it is possible, in South Kanara, to raise a profitable plantation by the use of the "dry" method from the beginning.

There is nothing new in the "dry" cultivation method. It has been practised in Malabar, and with success, for

generations. A fair proportion of the Malabar gardens, i.e., those situated on the banks of rivers or backwaters or on the fringes of low-lying double crop wet lands do not, in any case, require artificial irrigation. As regards the rest, artificial irrigation is common only in the flat coastal area where the sandy soil has no capacity for retaining moisture and quickly becomes parched in the dry season. The dry cultivation of coconuts on the terraced slopes of low hills is especially common in Kurumbranad taluk. The majority of these gardens have never been irrigated at any stage; and their quality is generally good. The method of cultivation is very much the same as that advocated in leaflet No.44, except that the ryot is usually content with a single ploughing at the beginning of the South West Monsoon I dislike generalising about South Kanara, as my experience is confined to a part only of the district I think it true to say that this method was not commonly followed in South Kanara. The South Kanara ryot grew his coconuts in situations where they had a fairly constant supply of water all the year round or irrigated them artificially. The difference between the two districts is certainly surprising. I have put to several people, including officers of the Agricultural Department, the question, --considering that the ryots of Malabar, especially of Kurumbranad taluk, have always cultivated coconuts without irrigation,-- why has the method not been followed i South Kanara? I have not received any satisfactory answer and it is not easy to believe, as is assumed in paragraph 18 (second part) of the Leaflet No.44, that it is due entirely to the ignorance or indifference of the South Kanara ryot. The success of the method in Kurumbranad may be due to some special quality of soil, climate or situation. I cannot say. The old view in South Kanara was, evidently, that the only kinds of land in the District really suitable for coconut cultivation are the banks of rivers and backwater and the sandy coastal area (where gardens are usually ifrigated by artificial means). I think it is too early for us to assert with confidence that this view was incorrect.

The trees in ~~block II of~~ the Nileshwar No.2 station appear to be healthy enough, though immature for their age. A close inspection reveals that the yield is disappointing and the figures which are kept for each tree, prove this beyond doubt. The statement given by the Deputy Director shows the yield up to 1931. The 1932 yield was much inferior to that of 1931. I append a statement which shows, in general, a considerable falling off the figures of 1931. 1932 was not a good year for coconuts, it ought not to have affected to such an extent the yield of a growing plantation. And I understand that this year's yield is even poorer than that of 1932, inspite of abundant rainfall. The only explanation I can offer is this: The really novel featur of the Nileshwar plantation was that the method of surface plantin was adopted. This method is discussed in paragraph 9 of the leaflet. The Agricultural Department have now. apparently, decided that this method which was based on a belief that the coconut tree is a surface feeder was a mistake. I understand that the existing trees in No.2. station are to be removed and replaced by new seedlings, which will not be planted on the surface. Blocks V and VI have been almost entirely cleared and felling is still going on. Some of the trees have been replanted in another piece of land owned by the Department. Others have been sold. Unfortunately the method of surface planting produced up to the time of flowering, a quick, fair growth which appeared to demonstrate the success of the method. Its inherent defect is that it restricts the growth of the root system with the result that the tree has not the vigour to produce the number of nuts it ought to.

It will be observed that the yield of block II is much inferior to that of block I, although the two plantations are of the same sort of soil, were started at the same time, and have received the same treatment. I am told that this cannot definitel

be explained but may be due to the fact that the drainage is bad in parts of Block II. This supports the inference that natural conditions count enormously in the growth of coconuts, and that before applying new methods of cultivation it should first be ascertained what natural conditions are suitable.

The accounts of the cultivation expenses are straightforward enough. Annual cultivation now costs the Department between 7-8 annas per tree. Any figure substantially above 8 annas is due to manurial experiments. The ryot could probably do it for a little less, by saving something on labour charges, and from my discussion with officers of the Agricultural Department and with coconut planters, I consider that the ryot could give the full treatment advocated by the Department for about 6 annas a tree Whether the ryots of South Kanara who have taken up the dry cultivation of coconuts are spending as much as that is a different matter. In Serial No.112 of the demonstration plots shown in the leaflet, which I inspected, and which is extremely well cared for, the expense must be about 6 annas per tree. In others it is obviously not as much as annas a tree.

The Nileshwar No.III plantation is in general definitely inferior to No.II. It is planted on coarse sandy soil which contains little organic matter and has no capacity for retaining water. I am inclined to think that it is impossible to raise a really successful plantation, on soil of this nature, without irrigating it at least until it reaches maturity.

perhaps, to its doubtful method of planting does not prove anything. It could not even be asserted with confidence that it will become profitable in 25 years, or ever. The dry "demonstration" plots in South Kanara are too young for any conclusions to be based on them. Then again it would not be practicable to apply an age limit at present. The age of a "demonstration" plot is given, but in general we do not know the age of a plantation and if it came to a dispute with a ryot as to whether a plantation was more or less than 25 years old, I would not care to give a decision, in the absence of any record of the date of planting, on an Inspector's estimate or even on my own estimate of the age. During the currency of resettlement there will be a regular inspection of dry lands and the year in which any dry land is planted with coconut trees will be noted. It might then be possible, and, looking a long way ahead, I should think it would be desirable to exempt new gardens from reclassification until they reach a certain age. It would go a long way to meet the chief objection of the ryot:--that he spends a good deal on laying out a plantation, continues to spend for a number of years until the trees begin to bear and then, as soon as he starts getting nuts finds his assessment raised, sometimes by a substantial amount. This objection will probably become more pronounced after resettlement when there will be no waiting for a period of 30 years before the reclassification of dry lands. I venture to submit that the whole questic of reclassifying dry lands during the currency of resettlement is one which requires separate investigation.

The Deputy Director mentions the figure of 25 nuts per year. In my reference 3257/33 (Confidential) dated 9/10/33, I suggested, tentatively, a figure of 15 nuts with reference to a similar point which was raised in Malabar. The lowest garden rate in Malabar is however Rs.1-3-0 whereas the lowest rate in South Kanara will be at Resettlement Rs.2-4-0. In considering the question what the yield of a tree should be to justify its being

counted as a garden tree, I find myself embarassed by the fact that we take the very low number of 10 coconut trees as sufficient for the reclassification of one acre of land. No ryot who starts a regular plantation plants his trees as thinly as 10 to the acre but since we take that figure we ought to be able to justify it The 10 tree garden was not really considered in working out the rates at the last settlement. I invite attention to the proposal of the Deputy Commissioner printed in Proceedings of the Governmen of Madras, No.757, Revenue, dated the 25th August 1902. paragraphs 75 and 77. It will be seen that for his proposal A the Deputy Commissioner took 25 trees as the standard, for determining the outturn for proposal B, Block I, 30 trees and for Block II, 20 trees. The outturns are given in paragraph 88 and the money rates in paragraph 102. The lowest outturn which the Deputy Commissioner considered was 480 nuts per year for which the half net worked out at Rs.2-11-7. Rs.2/(the lowest garden rate) would have been the appropriate rate, according to the Deputy Commissioner's method for an outturn of about 350 nuts, and it is not every 10 tree garden which yields that number. The Deputy Commissioner's proposals were not approved and the question was solved by classing gardens as best superior, good, ordinary, infe bad and worst and assessing them at arbitrary rates ranging from Rs.8 to Rs.2. I quote the Deputy Commissioner's calculations however to show that if the rates had finally been fixed in accord with a detailed enquiry into the money value of the produce it would have been difficult to find a place in the Scheme for a 10 tree bad or worst garden I may add that it would be equally difficult to fit into the Scheme a 50 or 60 tree best garden since a calculation of money values would have shown that for such "best" gardens Rs.14 or 15 would have been moderate assessme This sort of defect, that the rates are too low for the best lands and press heavily on the worst is perhaps common to all settleme but it does seem more than usually pronounced in the West Coast

garden classification.

The Deputy Director takes the value of a nut, to the ryot, as 6 pies. The price of coconuts varies a good deal from time to time and from place to place, but, after enquiry I am of the opinion that this is about as much as the ryot can hope to get at present, except in certain favoured localities. Taking 25 nuts per tree, and 10 trees (the minimum number) the value of the produce would be .. .. Rs 7-13-0

Deduct cultivation expenses (10 × 6 as) Rs 3-12-0

Remainder Rs 4- 1-0

The minimum garden assessment Rs 2-4-0 would represent more than half the net produce. The actual resettlement commutation rate is Rs 24-12-0 (Rs 22 plus 12½%) and at a time when prices are falling it is not safe to examine the effect of resettlement rate at anything higher than the actual commutation rate. According to the principles of settlement, the resettlement rate should represent half the net produce at the actual commutation rate. The amount allowed, for cultivation expenses can be worked out as follows:

	Rs	As	Ps
Value of 250 nuts @ Rs 24-12-0 per 1000 ..	6	3	0
Deduct Rs 2-4-0 (lowest garden rate) as Government's half net and another Rs 2-4-0 as the ryots' half net.	4	8	0
Remainder	1	11	0

I have no doubt that Rs 1-11-0 would ordinarily cover the amount actually spent by the ryot on 10 average trees. But it would appear that by this "dry" cultivation method the ryot may spend as much as 6 annas per tree without getting anything more than an inferior yield He could afford even at this rate to pay a garden assessment on 20 trees or more to the acre but not on 10. I may observe that if the "dry" cultivation method requires an annual expenditure of 6 annas per tree, with no profit for

25 years (as estimated by the Deputy Director) then in my opinion the ryot will drop it. I do not think it is any use pursuing the question of money values further than this. It is impossible to evolve a comprehensive formula for classification of gardens since the whole system of garden classification is largely artificial. There is not much harm in this, since the rates for "best" gardens are extremely favourable and the rates for others can be scaled down All that is necessary is that at the bottom of the scale, in dealing with what I should call "minimum" gardens the Settlement Officer must be allowed a fairly wide discretion to retain such gardens as dry, and must not be restricted to the application of hard and fast rules. I presume in view of our experience in Malabar that Government is prepared to concede this. I certainly think that we should deal leniently with the new "dry" gardens of South Kanara. They were started, from about 1920 onwards the belief that by the "dry" method waste lands could readily be converted into good gardens ("Money in coconuts" was the slogan posted on the "demonstration" plots); and very considerab sums of money have been invested in these , partic in the area around Trikarpur and Chervattur, Kasaragod taluk. I propose that in dealing with new gardens, cultivated by the dry method we should not reclassify them unless they can be considere mature and productive. I do not wish to commit myself at present to any precise definition of the phrase "mature and productive" I do believe that in classifying gardens precise definitions are not helpful when you come down to "hard cases". As regards the gardens we are now considering, I think that in general they will obviously be immature and not productive. I have inspec a number of plots, planted from 1923 onwards, and those I saw could not be reclassified even by a strict application of the "ten bearing tree" rule. The result will be that most, probably all, of the new "dry" gardens started on the advice of the

Agricultural Department will not be reclassified at Resettlement.

18. I venture to submit that the "dry" cultivation of coconuts in South Kanara should at present be recommended as an experiment only, for those who can afford to experiment.

W Lucas

Special Settlement Officer.

P.S.A./21-11.

Copy submitted to Board
Board 1 Revenue.

Endorsement of the Collector of South Kanara, dated 26th November 1933.

Submitted to the Board.

2 I too was camping at Nileshwar in October and I went into the question. I have little to add to Mr. Bouchier's interesting report. For the decision of the matter in hand it is important that Mr. Bouchier holds (and I agree with him) that the experimental dry coconut gardens in this district have <u>not</u> come to bearing to the extent that they could reasonably be classed as bearing cocoanut -- gardens and assessed as such now at resettlement. A tree with one or two nuts on it cannot be classed as a bearing tree, because cocoanut trees till now have been ~~thought~~ thought of as trees cultivated and irrigated in the -- traditional manner, which could be relied upon to produce

good

good crops of nuts as soon as they came to bearing. Even in the Nileshwar garden there will be seen one or two trees near the cooly huts, under which the coolies have done -- their washing (and perhaps other things). These trees are bearing profusely If then dry gardens are to be assessed hereafter, as soon as they come to bearing, it will be necessary to lay down that bearing' means -- bearing properly', or as Mr. Bouchier says 'mature and productive'.

3 It is a great pity that the Agricultural Department combined its campaign of dry cocoanut planting with surface planting because those that followed this advice are left with gardens whichare never likely to be good gardens Whether the Government in the Revenue Department can give any concession to ryots who have followed advice by another department, which is now found to be bad advice, is another matter. So far as my observation goes, the advice was followed by those who can afford to bear the loss. The ordinary ryot in South Kanara is not easily persuaded to grow cocoanuts in a different way to that used by his -- grandfather, and he went unmoved by the advertisement boar of the Agricultural Department, which were prominent in -- 1927 but have all been removed now. There would therefor be little difficulty in compiling a list of dry cocoanut plantations started under the advice of the Agricultural Department

Statement showing the yield of the Nileshwar No.II Station

in 1932.

Block No.	No. of trees flowered up to 1932.	Total yield.	in 1931	Average per bearing tree.
I.	142 (142)	2,355	2840	16.58
II.	139 (139)	943	1629	6.78
III.	115 (115)	1,450	1759	12.60
IV.	90 (90)	834	1217	9.26
V.	98 (100)	2,064	2077	21.06
VI.	97 (98)	1,092	1504	11.25

Revenue Dept.

Settlement. Resettlement. (South Kanara)
Coconut plantations as dry lands -
Classification as garden.

Ex.No.3+b/E/33. From the Director of Agriculture
pp 1 - 2cr D.O. No. 1483/33 dy 27/9/33.

Tour

Please see the letter from the Director of Agriculture at pp 1 - 2cr. Under the rule relating to the ~~existing~~ existing settlement in South Kanara, ten bearing Coconut palms to an acre shall render a dry field or ~~kuruvan~~ kuruvan assessable as garden. In para 3(4) of G.O. No. 147 Rev. dy 23.1.29, the Govt have tentatively approved the proposal that dry lands which have been converted into garden should be reclassified as garden at the ensuing resettlement in South Kanara.

2. The criterion recommended by the Director of Agriculture in para 2 at p 2 cr is accepted for purposes of garden classification in South Kanara. It may become necessary to adopt the same criterion in Malabar where * also the rule mentioned at 'A' on p 3 cr is in force during Hosr's recent visit to Malabar, ~~disturbances~~ certain hardships resulting

* See para 14 of instructions at pp 6-7 in 2717 Rev/23.12.31 (J)

2/36

Forest clearance of lands in Malabar
at resettlement were brought to notice / the
Board of Rev has been consulted inter
alia proposing Jammabandi
to deal with the landlords the Board's
reply on the subject has not yet been
received the Board's remarks
obtained

Dispatched
vide G.O. 248 Rev dt 7.2.34 (L)

One of these was Rai a colonist
This is heard as
bearing even though it has
only one

Lands in para 2
at pp 4 5 Cl 2
in Top file

Sino disposed of
vide G.O. 248 Rev dt 7.2.34
Copy at (L)

Encl No 34 to letter dt 23 Rev dt
from the Board of Rev Proc No 3573/33-2 dt 20.12.33

Reg

Please see the orders at pp 1-2 infra,

the S.S.O's report and the Coll's Endt hereon at pp 21-30 Cf and the Board's Report at pp 17-19 Cf. In the Circumstances stated at pp 21-30 Cf., the Board agrees with the S.S.O that the dry Cocoanut plantations in S. Kanara should be kept as 'dry' if they are not mature and productive though possibly bearing. It is stated that this would result in few, if any, of the new 'dry' gardens stated on the advice given by Agl Dept in S. Kanara being classified as garden at resettlement.

para 2 at pp 17-18 Cf

(D) In his note at pp 5-6 of Part B no 3476 Fy 33 of 20.11.33, the Director of Agr has claimed certain advantages to flow from 'dry' system of cultivation. In para 3 at p 30 Cf, the Coll of S. Kanara has stated that the advice tendered by the Agl Dept is now found to be bad advice — see also Secy's note at p 2 supra.

. Bowhill's interesting notes on my comments (D) - that the S. Kanara experiment [illegible] p 30 Cf [illegible] disappointing.

2 With refce to para 2 at pp 1-2 supra the Board has proposed in the Dept file that certain Concessions (reduction of taram or partial remission) should be granted in the Case of those lands in Malabar which have been classified as garden at resettlement by a strict interpretation of the term "bearing Cocoanut tree".

rec disposed of in G.O. No. 248 P Revd 7.2.34 Copy at (K)

Notes at pp 46-47 Pt

3 With refce to para 3 at pp 18-19 Cf it will be observed from the B.P at pp 103-104 of

from 1942 Rly (Cash) of 26.10.33 that a similar (V) with
application was received on principle in
Malabar had the approval of the Board. The Since disposed of
principles tentatively approved by the for in GO No 248 Rev
Govt in their letter (47 Rly 28.1.33, (K) 9.2.34 Copy
closely followed those in their GO No 980 Rly 5.5.28. (P) approved for Malabar
The Board's Rly Y of 12.2.33 noted in
para 3 at p 18 ante in being recalled with
separately. No action on this para seems
necessary in this file.

It was stated in this Committee
with reference to the portion marked A at p 22, and
the rider at pp 22-23 of Govt. No 347 by Mr
of 20.11.33 in the Chamber that there
there would be little difficulty in Cambling
a district of Cocoanut Plantations owned
in S. Kanara under the advice of the
Agl Dept. It is for orders whether the
proposal in para 2 of the Bd's Ryes at
pp 17-18 ante will be accepted. Govt

Land and fast rule
may be approved.

17 JAN 1934
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Remarks 8467 Gen-2
15.1.34

Dev.

D.315 III
18.1.34

Dev Dept

To A.S.

Please see the notes above. Rev Secy suggestions may be accepted in this dept and the case ~~passed~~ returned to Dev

Dev 18.1.34) This seems to satisfy the proposal in ¶ 1-2 cf except that the S.S.O is to be given wide discretion in the matter. It may incidentally be noted that the S.S.O. and the Collector of S. Kanara are of opinion that the improvements introduced by the Agl. Dept. in respect of growing of Coconut on dryland (referred to by the S.S.O in ¶ 2 cf.) are not a success and that any scheme of such gardens will be reclassified at Resettlement

¶¶ 28-29 and 29-31 cf

The file may be returned to Revenue.

29/1

Rs 600 E
29.1.34.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
29 JAN 1934
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Rev 25-7-34

RR 26/1/34 S. 29/1

Revenue

D 315 III/34
27.1.34.

LCO

Revenue Dept.

Tours

(Notes at pp. 4-5 hereof)

A draft order is subd for approval. Finance

Yours sec.

2/2/34

JMK. 1/2/34

9.2.34

Revenue 3467/E/33-3

6-2-34

Fin

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
7 FEB 1934
FINANCE DEPT.

Finance (Admin)

Submitted that the draft order 4385 each

may be perused and the case returned

to Revenue.

9.2.34 9.2.34

10.2.34

Fin 4385 Auth-Inc

14.2.34

Rev

Type R 85 E

14.2.34

Rev. Dept.

14 FEB 1934

Tours

For notes as to issue of draft order. Draft typed 144

2

C.F.16.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

Rev

	Date.	Initials.
When received for fair copying ..		
When copied ..		
When examined..		
When signed ..		
When despatched.		

SUBJECT:— dear Secy for DP 19 2

READ AGAIN ~~for~~ P 147 Rev. , dated 23. 1. 1929. (K)

" " _____ " _____ 19____

READ *ALSO*:—

No 3467/33 From the Director of Agn, Dy, No. 1483/33, dated 27. 9. 1932 pp1-2 cf

" _____ " Board of Rev (Sett) Cyce 7 " 3513/33-2 20. 12. 1933. pp17-19 cf

" _____ " _____ " _____ " _____ 19____.

~~Resolution~~ Order ~~Reat.~~ Ms. No._____, dated_____ 19____.

Under para 6 (1) of the ~~Settlement~~ notification for the South Kanara District approved in Govt 917 Revy. 9. 10. 1902, ten bearing Cocoanut palms to an acre render a ~~fie~~ Survey field or sub-division assessable as garden. For the purpose of enabling the Settlement Officer to prepare his scheme report for the resettlement of that District, the Govt in Jan. 1929 ~~approved~~ tentatively ~~in January 1929~~ as shown the proposal of the Board of

para 131 of proceedings VII. below ff (C)

para 3 (4) of P 147 Rev 23. 1. 29 at P 1 ante (K)

* See para 2 and P 1 ante

W

Reserve land by laws in Areas which have been converted into garden plots to be reclassified as garden at resettlement. The Director of Agriculture ~~has brought to notice~~ considers that the criteria guiding the number of acres allocated to six acres for purpose of garden classification should be reviewed in case of dry cultivation ~~a Ranch~~ since acreage in most cases the plot depicts as ~~the plant~~ ~~has not yet~~ given to wield sufficiently to give adequate a person. He has recommended that for classification at resettlement the criterion to be adopted should be that plots should be 25 years old before the area should be cleared.

examined the suggestion ~~given~~
~~Director of Agriculture~~ in Consultation
with the Sec to IV Party to
Offr of S. Kanara and the Bom
of Rev. The S Sec considers
that all that is necessary is
that when dealing with gardens
~~where the bottom land~~ which
which would in any case be placed
~~dealing with wood ought~~
in the lowest taram
~~called minimum~~ gardens, the
Settl Offrs ~~shd~~ should be allowed
a fairly wide discretion in deciding
and should classify as 'garden'
~~doubtful gardens without being~~
~~restricted to the application of~~
~~hard and fast rules~~. He
has proposed that dry Coconut
plantations in S. Kanara should
not be classified as garden
but should be left as 'dry' if
they are not mature and
productive though possibly bearing
He has stated that if this
principle is adopted, it would
result in only a few, probably
none, of the new 'dry' Coconut
gardens started on the advice
of the Agl dept being reclassi-
fied as garden at resettlement

Sectt. II-5 (b)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for Fair-copying.		
When copied ..		
When examined ..		
When signed ..		
When despatched ..		

20-2

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 147 Rev., dated 23-1-1929 ~~19~~

" " " " " " 19

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 3467-E/33 From the Dr. of Agre., No. D.3.1483/33 dated 27-9-33. ~~19~~

" " " " Board of Rev., (L.R & S) Ref No. 3513/33-2 " 20-12-33 ~~19~~

" " " " " " " 19

ORDER.

Ms.

No. 351, dated 20-2- 1934.

Under paragraph 6 of the Settlement notification for the South Kanara district approved in G.O.No.917 Revenue, dated 9-10-1902, ten bearing coconut palms to an acre render a survey field o sub-division assessable as garden.

For the purpose of enabling the Settlement Officer to prepare his scheme repor for the re-settlement of that district, the Government in January 1929 tentative approved the proposal of the Board of Revenue that dry lands in the district

which have been converted into garden should be reclassified as garden at re-settlement. The Director of Agriculture considers that the strict application of the rule will prejudicially affect coconut gardens started without irrigation or with restricted irrigation on the advice of the Agricultural department, as in most cases these gardens will not yet be yielding sufficiently to give the cultivators a profit. He has recommended that, for classification at re-settlement, the criterion to be adopted should be that where coconuts are so grown trees should be 25 years old before they are treated as "bearing"

2. The Government have examined the suggestion in consultation with the S.S.O., No.IV Party, the Collector of South Kanara and the Board of Revenue. The S.S.O. considers that all that is necessary is that when dealing with gardens which would in any case be placed in the lowest tarams, the

Settlement Officer should be allowed a fairly wide discretion in deciding whether the land should be classified as 'garden' He has proposed that 'dry' coconut plantations in South Kanara should not be classified as garden but should be left as 'dry' if they are not mature and productive though possibly bearing. He has stated that if this principle is adopted, it would result in only a few, probably none, of the new 'dry' coconut gardens started on the advice of the Agricultural department being re-classified as garden at re-settlement. The Collector and the Board agree with the S.S.O. The Government consider that the proposals of the S.S.O.will meet the requirements of the case and accept them.

T.N.S.R.
2-2-34.

J.A.T.
6-2-34.